

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated May 5, 2005, claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-24, 26-28, 30-34, 36-54, 56, 57, 59, 60, and 62 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-24, 26-34, and 36-62 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW

Reference is made to a telephonic interview between the Applicants' attorneys, Georgann S. Grunebach, and Victor G. Cooper, and Examiner Christopher R. Nalevanko on June 28, 2005. In this interview, the scope of the claims were compared with scope of the Ito publication. The Applicants' attorneys thank the Examiner for his helpfulness in understanding the root of the rejections presented in the Final Office Action and his helpfulness in identifying patentable subject matter.

III. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for purposes of patentability.

Specifically, in the Examiner's interview described below, it was indicated that the multiple copies of receiver identification data features of claim 1 might be read so broadly as to include repeated data bits. For example, if the receiver ID were "0001001001110", it is argued that the repetition of the "001" sequence (or for that matter, the "010" sequence might read on "inserting multiple copies of receiver identification data into data representing a frame of the television content". While the Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claim can be read as such (since it indicates that multiple *copies* of the receiver identification data is inserted, and the foregoing are not *copies* of each other, simply because they have the same value) the Applicants have amended the claims to recite that multiple copies of the receiver identification are inserted.

It was also suggested that the claims be amended to recite that the multiple copies are inserted into *each* frame of television content data. However, upon reflection, the Applicants' decline to amend the claim in this way. The Applicants invention inserts multiple copies of the receiver identification into a frame of the television content data, but need not insert multiple copies into each and every such frame. Based on the Applicants' understanding of the Ito reference and the other art of record, the Applicants believe that the claims adequately distinguish themselves from the prior art without the "each" language.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: July 5, 2005

By: Victor G. Cooper
Name: Victor G. Cooper
Reg. No.: 39,641

VGC/